

1 Richard E. Levine (SB #88729)
2 LEVINE & BAKER LLP
3 One Maritime Plaza, Suite 400
4 San Francisco, CA 94111
5 Telephone: (415) 391-8177
6 Facsimile: (415) 391-8488
7 rlevine@levinebakerlaw.com

8
9 Joseph V. Norvell (*pro hac vice*)
10 Joseph T. Kucala (*pro hac vice*)
11 Jay M. Burgett (*pro hac vice*)
12 NORVELL IP LLC
13 1776 Ash Street
14 Northfield, IL 60093
15 Telephone: (847) 809-2212
16 Facsimile: (312) 268-5063
17 jnorvell@norvellip.com

18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
19 ROBERT TRENT JONES II, INC.
20 ROBERT TRENT JONES LICENSING GROUP, LLC

21
22
23
24
25
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 ROBERT TRENT JONES II, INC. and
17 ROBERT TRENT JONES LICENSING
18 GROUP, LLC

Case No. 07-CV-04913-SC

19 Plaintiffs,
20 v.
21 GFSI, INC. d/b/a GEAR FOR SPORTS,
22 INC.
23 Defendant.
24
25

**[PROPOSED ORDER] REGARDING
PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO
EVIDENCE OFFERED BY DEFENDANT
IN ITS OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY
INJUNCTION**

**Date: January 25, 2008
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Judge Samuel Conti**

1 Plaintiffs, Robert Trent Jones II, Inc. and Robert Trent Jones Licensing Group, LLC,
2 through their counsel, have submitted their Objections to Evidence Offered by Defendant in its
3 Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction. These Objections are limited to the
4 Declaration of Larry Graveel.

5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

6 **Objection No. 1:** Paragraph 9: The sentence "However, to accommodate RTJ2's request,
7 we ceased selling to these alleged 'discount stores' when RTJ2 raised concerns." lacks proper
8 foundation.

9 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

10 Overruled: _____

11 **Objection No. 2:** Paragraph 12: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
12 inadmissible hearsay.

13 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

14 Overruled: _____

15 **Objection No. 3:** Paragraph 13: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
16 inadmissible hearsay. This paragraph also contains inadmissible hearsay from an unnamed
17 "corp. representative at Neiman Marcus."

18 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

19 Overruled: _____

20 **Objection No. 4:** Paragraph 14: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
21 inadmissible hearsay.

22 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

23 Overruled: _____

1 **Objection No. 5:** Paragraph 15: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
2 inadmissible hearsay.

3 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

4 Overruled: _____

5 **Objection No. 6:** Paragraph 16: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
6 inadmissible hearsay.

7 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

8 Overruled: _____

9 **Objection No. 7:** Paragraph 17: The sentence “GFSI classifies The Golf Warehouse as a
10 “Golf Specialty Store” because GFSI believes The Golf Warehouse is properly considered a Golf
11 Specialty Store, not a ‘discount’ or ‘Secondary-Market’ store.” is irrelevant.

12 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

13 Overruled: _____

14 **Objection No. 8:** Paragraph 18: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
15 inadmissible hearsay.

16 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

17 Overruled: _____

18 **Objection No. 9:** Paragraph 19: This paragraph lacks proper foundation.

19 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

20 Overruled: _____

21 **Objection No. 10:** Paragraph 20: This paragraph lacks proper foundation and contains
22 inadmissible hearsay.

23 **Court's Ruling:** Sustained: _____

1 Overruled: _____
2
3

4 Dated: _____
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Entered: _____
Senior Judge Samuel Conti
U.S. District Court Judge